THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 14, No. 47 (Broadcast 691) November 18, 1968 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

WALLACE SAVED NIXON

Though state and local leadership of the American Independent Party was largely in the hands of constitutional conservatives, the mass of George Wallace's voting support, outside the old South, was among people who have traditionally voted for liberal Democrats. That is why I said, six weeks before the election (in the September 23 issue of this *Report*):

"If Wallace were not running, Humphrey would probably squeak through to victory as Kennedy did in 1960, because of . . . Democrats who want a change but cannot bring themselves to vote Republican."

"There are millions of laboring people . . . in the industrial centers of the North who will not vote Republican because they have thoroughly absorbed the false propaganda that the Republican Party represents only the wealthy, the management class, the employers. These same people, however, are sick and tired of Democrat administrations. They are even more determined to get a change in Washington than most businessmen are. Wallace gives them the chance they want. They are climbing on his bandwagon . . . ."

Analysis of the voting now proves I was correct. Note this from a November 7, 1968, Associated Press story reporting information from Democrat leaders who said bluntly that George Wallace was responsible for the defeat of Hubert Humphrey:

"George C. Wallace's third-party effort for the presidency appears to have played a substantial part in putting Republican Richard M. Nixon in the White House.

"The votes he pulled in five key industrial states—California, Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, and Wisconsin—could have had the effect of nudging these states and their 121 electoral votes into Nixon's column . . . .

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas, Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $18.00 for 2 years; $10.00, 1 year; $6.00, 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1968. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Wallace appears to have pulled much of his support from . . . blue-collar union workers. This group usually supports Democrats, and even though Wallace drew relatively small totals in these states they may have included enough normally Democratic votes to have denied large chunks of electoral votes to Hubert H. Humphrey."

Wallace's contribution to Nixon's victory was probably much greater than this AP story indicates. It is likely that another 50 electoral votes (those of Alaska, Delaware, Indiana, Kentucky, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon) would also have gone to Humphrey instead of Nixon if Wallace had not been running.

The AP analysis assumes (and most Republican Party spokesmen categorically assert) that the five southern states which Wallace carried (Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, and Mississippi) would have given their 45 electoral votes to Nixon if Wallace had not been running—and that Texas' 25 electoral votes would have gone to Nixon instead of Humphrey.

But Nixon would not have carried *all* of those states in a two-way race with Humphrey. He carried none of them in the 1960 contest with Kennedy. Goldwater carried four of the Wallace states in 1964, but only because Wallace withdrew from the race and threw his support to Goldwater.

In 1968, Alabama gave 65% of the vote to Wallace, 15% to Humphrey, 14% to Nixon. Arkansas gave 41% of the vote to Wallace, 31% to Humphrey, 28% to Nixon. Georgia gave 43% of the vote to Wallace, 30% to Nixon, 27% to Humphrey. Louisiana gave 48% of the vote to Wallace, 29% to Humphrey, 23% to Nixon. Mississippi gave 63% of the vote to Wallace, 23% to Humphrey, 14% to Nixon.

Nixon's poor showing casts a shadow on the Republican claim that the South would have been a Nixon stronghold if Wallace had stayed out of the race.

However—because public feeling against Humphrey and the *national* Democrat Party is very strong in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Mississippi—let us assume that these states would have chosen Nixon if their only choice had been between him and Humphrey.

The same assumption cannot be made about Arkansas, because Nixon was part of the Eisenhower administration which sent troops into Little Rock in 1957. Arkansas went for Kennedy over Nixon in 1960, and for Johnson over Goldwater in 1964. Nixon would not have carried the state in 1968 under any circumstances.

In 1968, Humphrey carried Texas with a slim plurality over Nixon, with Wallace receiving 19% of the total vote. Republicans claim that most of this Wallace vote would have gone for Nixon if Wallace had not been running.

The fact that all statewide Texas Republican candidates and most local Republican candidates lost in 1968 (plus the fact that Texas went for Kennedy over Nixon in 1960, and for Johnson over Goldwater in 1964), raises some question about whether Nixon would have carried the state in a two-way race with Humphrey. But, since the combined Nixon and Wallace votes in Texas were considerably larger than the Humphrey vote, let us assume that Nixon would have carried Texas.

There is no possibility that Wallace kept Nixon from winning *any* state other than the five discussed: Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas—which, together, have 64 electoral votes.

Hence, the most that Wallace could have *taken away* from Nixon (by the most generous estimate of what Nixon could have done if Wallace had not been running) is 64 electoral votes.

But the Wallace candidacy *gave* Nixon (at the very least) the 121 electoral votes of California, Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

The net of 57 electoral votes, which Wallace caused Humphrey to lose and Nixon to get, gave Nixon the election.

The Wallace candidacy kept Humphrey from being elected—despite the fact that Humphrey

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

received 91% of the Negro vote (which totaled more than 6 million); despite the last-minute surge for Humphrey, which was caused by President Johnson's politically-timed announcement of the bombing halt in Vietnam; and despite the multi-million-dollar anti-Wallace drive of the big unions which, in the last week of the campaign, succeeded in deflecting from Wallace much of the blue-collar vote which he had attracted.

So, the Republican campaign slogan that "a vote for Wallace is a vote for Humphrey" was 180 degrees out of focus. It was the other way around. A vote for Wallace was a vote for Nixon.

Many Republican conservatives rather severely denounced Wallace conservatives as traitors to the cause of conservatism because they risked throwing the race to Humphrey.

But constitutionalists who supported Wallace considered conviction preferable to expediency as a guide to political action; and they were convinced that Wallace, though deficient as a constitutionalist, was closer to constitutional conservatism than Nixon was. Moreover, they saw in the Wallace candidacy an opportunity to help create a new political party oriented on constitutional principles. America desperately needs such a party.

Constitutionalists have no regrets about supporting Wallace, because, in throwing the race to Nixon, Wallace and his supporters made an enormous contribution to the cause of political conservatism.

If—as Wallaceites maintained during the campaign—there was not a dime's worth of difference between the Nixon program and the Humphrey program, what good did they do by helping elect Nixon? Why does it matter whether Nixon or Humphrey won? It matters for three reasons:

(1) If Wallace had not run, Humphrey would have received an electoral vote big enough to be touted as another mandate for liberalism. The combined Nixon and Wallace vote, defeating Humphrey, cannot possibly be construed as reflecting overwhelming public approval of liberalism.

(2) If Wallace had not run and Humphrey had gathered a substantial electoral-vote majority, we would have had a Democrat-controlled Congress, eager (at least during the "honeymoon" period) to support the new Democrat President. With a Republican in the White House, the Democrat-controlled Congress may not rush to rubber-stamp every presidential proposal. Congress may reassert itself, reassume some of the constitutional responsibility which it has illegally abdicated to the President, and put some brake on the legislative mill that has been grinding out multi-billion-dollar, unconstitutional programs.

Many commentators have been bemoaning the fact that Nixon will not have a friendly Congress, controlled by his own party, which would be likely to approve Nixon's legislative proposals. Constitutional conservatives take the opposite view. If we cannot have, in the White House and Congress, constitutional conservatives who will obey the Constitution and keep their sworn oaths to uphold and defend it, then we should pray for a President and Congress so hostile to each other that they will at least slow down the proliferation of programs that are dragging us into socialism at home and interventionist wars abroad.

(3) If Humphrey had won, the Republicans would be back in 1972 promising that a Republican President would give the people the change they want. With Nixon in the White House, we can fully measure the worth of that Republican promise. President Nixon will doubtless demonstrate (as Eisenhower did) that Republicans can be depended on no more than Democrats to give us lawful, constitutional government.

Nixon—as I said in this *Report* during the campaign—is a more facile political weathervane than Humphrey, and will be more likely to yield to conservative influence. This attribute of Nixon was obvious in the closing days of the race. Perceiving the enormous popular appeal of Wallace's stand on law and order, on local control of local institutions, on the bussing of school children, on the Supreme Court—Richard Nixon, during the last two weeks before election, sounded almost exactly like George Wallace.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the campaign gestures toward conservatism were insincere; if Nixon continues the same old bipartisan policies we have had for a generation, trying to disguise them by giving them new names —*then* by 1972 the people should *know* that the country must have a new political party.

Constitutional conservatives hoped the Wallace vote would be big enough to assure the establishment of the American Independent Party as a major political party for constitutionalists. This would have forced a political realignment the country sorely needs—conservatives gravitating eventually into the new party, leaving the two old parties to liberals. The Wallace vote was not big enough to accomplish that goal automatically; but it was enough to give us the best start we have ever had.

In every precinct throughout the nation, people who worked for Wallace in 1968 should go to work *now*, selecting, educating, and promoting candidates to run on the American Independent Party ticket for congressional seats in 1970.

If a respectable number of constitutional conservatives could be elected to Congress on the AIP ticket in 1970, the party could be a major political force by 1972.

If the party selects candidates who are inept and badly informed, or candidates who try to moderate the image of the party by adopting liberal platforms appealing to a broader spectrum of the public—then the party will die an early and ignominious death; and it will deserve that fate.

We do not need another political party that promises new names and labels for the same old socialist programs that Democrats and Republicans have been sponsoring for a generation.

We need a party founded on the principle that the Constitution is a binding contract, specifying all powers that the federal government may legally exercise, reserving to the states all government powers not clearly and specifically delegated to the federal establishment. We need a political party dedicated to full restoration of the independent American Republic—by elimination of domestic socialism and termination of the present internationalist foreign policy.

Let's get busy!

CHRISTMAS GIFTS

Again this year, you may purchase the latest *Dan Smoot Report* Bound Volume (1968) at our special Christmas price of $9.00—for yourself, or as gifts for family, friends, customers, employees (regular price $10.00).

Take advantage of our special Christmas price (until December 26, 1968) to complete your own library with volumes of former years. We can still furnish books for 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966 and 1967 at $9.00 each. The 1968 book will be delivered in February, 1969; but gift recipients will get a Christmas card announcing your gift.

We also offer reduced Christmas prices (until December 26, 1968) on other Dan Smoot books: *The Invisible Government*—cloth $3.50, pocketbook .75; *The Hope of the World*—$1.80; *America's Promise*—.45. Special order forms available.

Complete your gift shopping NOW . . . . in just a few minutes . . . . with one check.

SUBSCRIBE TO THE DAN SMOOT REPORT:

6 mo. — $6.00; 1 yr. — $10.00; 2 yrs. — $18.00

Please notify us of any change of address *before* you move. With increased postal rates, we no longer can afford to remail issues returned by the Post Office.

REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE
(for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	$ .25	100 copies	$ 6.50
10 copies	1.00	200 copies	12.00
25 copies	2.00	500 copies	28.00
50 copies	3.50	1000 copies	50.00

Texans Add 4% for Sales Tax
(Add 50¢ for special-handling postage)
THE DAN SMOOT REPORT TAylor 1-2303
BOX 9538 DALLAS, TEXAS 75214

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED